



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/298,453	04/13/1999	LAWRENCE M. BAIN	10990633-1	2072

22879 7590 10/20/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

//

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/298,453

Applicant(s)

BAIN ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. .In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Guedalia is concerned only with the server-side techniques, not with the client-side functionality and discloses the standard web browser whereas the current application includes claims directed towards method and system embodiments that involve both server-side and client-side implementations, and, in particular to an embodiment that includes an enhanced web browser that invokes an enhanced image viewer on the client computer (Remarks, page 4).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As admitted by Applicants, Guedalia discloses the server-side techniques. Guedalia also discloses zooming and spanning operations operated on the client side (col 22, line 62 to col 23, line 53). Therefore, Guedalia is involved with both client-side and server-side implementations as argued.

Also, according to Applicants, the client web browser of the current application is enhanced and is different from the standard web browser since said enhanced web browser includes the zooming and scrolling operations (Remarks, pages 4-5).

Guedalia has zooming and spanning features that can be applied to the images to alter the images at the client (col 4, lines 36-51; col 16 lines 35-51). The web browser in Guedalia, therefore, is an enhanced web browser as argued.

Applicants also argue that Guedalia does not employ image-relative coordinates on the client computer, does not store them on the client computer, and is concerned only with server-side techniques and implementations, not with client-side functionality employing image-relative coordinates since Guedalia explicitly states that Guedalia's "present invention provides a novel approach to clientless HTML-driven interactive image navigation over the Internet" (Remarks, page 4).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Guedalia discloses:

- image-relative coordinates on the client computer (col 23, line 54 to col 24, line 48)
- storing them on the client computer (col 4, lines 9-35: "... thus by caching these images within the client, the client provides an instant interactive response whenever the user navigates back to the same image..")
- client-side functionality employing image-relative coordinates (col 4, lines 36-51; col 16, lines 35-60)

Though Guedalia explicitly states that Guedalia's "present invention provides a novel approach to clientless HTML-driven interactive image navigation over the Internet", Guedalia further states that "the present invention also enables a client to interact with an image ... by selecting one of several commands, such as "zoom-in", "zoom-out", "pan" ... a "pan" command can be used to translate the image being displayed by a fixed pre-determined amount ..." (col 4, lines 36-51). That means, Guedalia is also concerned with the client-side functionality providing the capability of interacting with images at client.